DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 033 RC 009 978

AUTHOR Purohit, Sally R.; Clonts, Howard A.
TITLE A Comparison of Citizen and Leader Perceptions of Selected Quality of Life Indicators.
PUB DATE 6 Feb 77
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists (74th, Atlanta, Georgia, February 6-9, 1977). Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document - particularly tables 4 and 5

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Age Differences; *Attitudes; Census Figures; *Community Leaders; *Comparative Analysis; Demography; *Economic Development; *Quality of Life; Racial Differences; *Rural Population; Rural Urban Differences; Sex Differences; Social Indicators; *Social Services
IDENTIFIERS Alabama

ABSTRACT

A total enumeration of elected and appointed officials, a 30% sample of business firms in each of 3 counties, and a 2% sample of the household residents (N=a total of 800 respondents living in a 3-county rural area of Alabama) were surveyed for purposes of comparing the attitudes of leaders and citizens toward public services and economic development as related to quality of life. The demographic variables employed were: age, race, sex, work status, occupation, type of residence, and type of road. The public service variables were: water, sewage, solid waste disposal, health, public schools, telephone, energy, fire protection, welfare, law enforcement, media, recreation, libraries, and adult education. Results indicated: definite dissimilarities between specific attitudes in the three counties; substantial differences among the same sectors in different counties; substantial importance in some determinants' influence upon the levels of satisfaction with public services and perception of quality of life (differential access to resources - availability vs nonavailability of public services; differences in perspective, as exhibited by leaders with a universalistic outlook or citizens with a particularistic outlook; and differences in personal characteristics, such as sex, race, etc.). (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Comparison of Citizen and Leader Perceptions of Selected Quality of Life Indicators*

Sally R. Purohit and Howard A. Clonts**
Auburn University

Introduction

In 1974 a joint project between the Alabama Cooperative Extension Service and the Agricultural Experiment Station was undertaken to examine public services and economic development in selected rural communities in Alabama. This was a three year project under Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972.

This project was begun in light of the economic decline facing many rural communities in Alabama in the 1970's. Three counties (Clay, Cleburne, and Randolph) were selected primarily on the basis of their demographic and economic characteristics. The counties located in east central Alabama are predominantly rural, have lost population in recent years, have a lower per capita income than the average for the state of Alabama, have low levels of public services such as public water and waste disposal services, and have suffered from out-migration of young and middle-aged people, etc. These conditions all pointed to the need for some form of community development. Much of the project area was located near centers of economic growth in both Alabama and Georgia. The effects of economic change in nearby areas should be felt in these three counties during the next few years. Hence, there was also evidence of the need for careful planning of rural development.

The aim of the present study was to provide certain types of information essential to policy-makers who must make rural development decisions. Specifically, the purpose behind this work was to investigate the impact of community facilities and services on the attitudes of both citizens and leaders towards quality of life.

Literature Review

The basic criterion on which many of the project objectives were based was the quality of life in a respondent's local area. Quality of life is a concept popularized in recent years which is employed to refer to feelings or levels of well-being, happiness, contentment, and satisfaction among people (Coleman, 1975:1). It is a multifaceted concept embracing many aspects of living. Sufficient evidence has been gathered to indicate that there is a wide range of opinion as to what constitutes the content of quality of life. The utility of such a concept is that if it can be adequately and reliably measured, then relative differences in social well-being can be assessed for use in public policy planning and evaluative research (Steelman and Evans, 1976:1).

---

*Data reported here were taken from the Title V project (Rural Development Act), Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Agricultural Experiment Station.

**Research Associate and Associate Professor, respectively.

RC 009 978

Paper presented at the 74th Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists, Atlanta, Georgia, February 6-9, 1977.

There is more than one level at which quality of life can be conceptualized. Is it a combination of incomparable elements such as Gerson (1976:799) has recently suggested in his use of the idea-"patterns of commitment"-by individuals and settings? Or as more commonly utilized, is it an overall feeling to which various variables contribute?

The latter viewpoint is apparent in the conceptual models of Campbell et al. (1976) and Marans and Rodgers (1974). Quality of life is broken down into component "domains" in which decisions are made by the individual concerning satisfaction with various aspects of his or her environment. These decisions are initially determined through awareness of the objective attributes of the particular domain filtered to the individual by his or her perceptions. Assessments are made at this point. Interacting with this decision-making process are personal characteristics and standards of comparison for the particular environmental attributes.

While individual assessments of the various domains of quality of life theoretically result in some global sense of well-being, some measurements of such general concepts have not been very reliable. However, Campbell and associates were able to discover that satisfaction with several domains accounted for a substantial portion of overall well-being (Campbell et al., 1976:95; Marans and Rodgers, 1974:306).

In contrast, Dalkey et al. (1972) utilized an analysis of the interaction between qualities of individual events and "determiners" or properties of the individual. Several models may be formulated, depending on the type of choice behavior assumed, and how behavioral consequences are taken into account. According to the conceptualization of Dalkey et al., quality of life was defined as the extent to which individual psychophysiological needs are met. In the present study, quality of life is interpreted as an overall sense of well-being to which various variables contribute.

Research Procedures

There are two basic approaches to the measurement of quality of life: subjective and objective. It has been substantiated that the objective characteristics of a person's life (e.g. material things, such as income, housing, schools, etc.) and the evaluation of this objective environment by a person are two different entities. On one level, discrepancies between the real situation and an individual's perception of that situation frequently occur, and are the subject of study by many social scientists. On another level, an individual's standard of comparison for evaluating any aspect of his or her life influences the perception of that aspect. Standards of comparison are probably the result of multiple determinants and may differ according to the particular situation. Thus it becomes apparent that objective and subjective indicators of life quality cannot be equated (Marans and Rodgers, 1975:302-303).

In this report the subjective assessments are utilized in a three-county study designed to examine the attitudes of residents in the three project counties towards public services and economic development. Census data were available on certain objective social and economic indicators regarding each county. However, a survey of residents was made which aimed at subjective measurements of the attitudes of three different sectors of the population: (1) elected and appointed officials (at state, federal, and local levels), (2) managers and/or owners of businesses, and (3) household heads or their spouses. The sampling procedures utilized in collecting data for the survey

were geographically and demographically representative of the population within each of the three counties. The Census enumeration district was the sampling unit for the household residents and business leaders. A total enumeration of elected and appointed officials, a 30% sample of business firms in each county, and a 2% sample of the household residents was undertaken. The 800 respondents in the study represent approximately 6% of the total number of households in the three-county area.

Demographic Characteristics of the Citizenry

Table 1 shows that the relationship of perceived quality of life to the age distribution of the residents revealed no particular pattern. Most residents ranked the quality of life as fair or poor regardless of age. Sex and race, however, were better predictors of perceived quality of life. Males and nonwhites were more likely to rate the quality of life as fair or poor compared to females and whites. Since the population in the study area is predominantly white, the proportion of nonwhites in the sample was relatively small (12%). However, the tendency of nonwhites to rank the subjective quality of life as lower than whites has been widely documented (Alston et al., 1974; Pieper et al., 1974).

Four other characteristics which are partially indicative of socioeconomic status, occupation of household head, work status of interviewee, type of residence, and type of road on which the residence is located were utilized in order to further describe those persons who subjectively rated their quality of life as high or low. An analysis of the relationship between work status and perceived quality of life showed that those persons fully employed were more likely to rate their quality of life as very good or good than persons employed on a part-time basis or the unemployed or retired. Campbell and associates (1976:313) also found that unemployment status made a definite difference in satisfaction with other aspects of their lives when compared to persons holding full-time jobs. In our study occupation of household head did not significantly distinguish between ratings of levels of quality of life, which substantiates the findings of Singh and Snow (1976).

Type of residence also failed to differentiate between persons rating the quality of life as either high or low, but this result was probably a consequence of the residence patterns of the study area. Most families lived in separated single family dwellings. Also, in rural areas, multi-family dwellings are scarce. A subjective rating by the interviewer of the socioeconomic status of the homes would have been more likely to be positively related to subjective quality of life because it would have differentiated between types of homes to a greater extent. The type of road (paved or not) did significantly distinguish between those persons who had high or low assessments of quality of life. Persons who lived on paved roads had relatively higher assessments of the quality of life when compared to persons who lived on other types of roads. This finding may have been significant because it represents a rather crude measure of socioeconomic status--poorer homes are more likely to be located on unpaved roads than higher status homes.

Comparison of Citizenry and Business and Government Leaders

Some of the demographic information on business and government leaders generally thought to be desirable was unavailable in this study. However,

some tentative formulations are possible. Since the majority of the business and government leaders were white males, sex and race would not have been particularly meaningful variables. Age, however, was utilized as a variable for all three sectors, but a statistically significant relationship was observed only for the business leaders. The younger business leaders (under 35) tended to rate quality of life as fair or poor to a greater extent than did either household residents or government officials. Middle-aged and older business respondents had similar responses.

Although no specific socioeconomic measures were employed in this study, occupation was utilized as a control variable for the household and government leader subsamples. For the business managers and owners, level of occupational prestige was fairly uniform. Since the governmental leadership position was not necessarily the only occupation held by a leader, the occupational prestige of the government leaders was measured. A statistically significant relationship was found between occupational prestige and assessments of quality of life for the leader sector: white collar employees were more likely than blue-collar workers to rate the overall quality of life as good or very good. While this same tendency was observed among the household subsample, it was a fairly weak relationship. Since the business leaders were all white-collar workers, it is interesting to note that a smaller proportion of the business owners/managers rated the quality of life as relatively high than did the blue-collar community officials. This analysis thus revealed that while occupational prestige may make a difference among some subsamples, it was not an important explanatory variable.

Quality of Life and Satisfaction with Public Services

General Findings

An analysis of the relationship between perceived quality of life and levels of satisfaction with public services for all three sectors in the study area revealed statistically significant inter-correlations* in several cases, particularly in the business sector (Table 2). No significant relationships emerged for government leaders. For business leaders, solid waste disposal, media, and recreation were positively correlated with quality of life. The only significant relationships that emerged for household respondents were between quality of life and fire protection and welfare. In all cases, the correlations were positive, indicating that persons who ranked the quality of life high also ranked satisfaction with a particular public service as high.

---

*These correlations are Spearman's rho rankings which measure the direction and strength of an association between two variables. This does not indicate anything about causation, but only about the differences in ranks between two variables. A statistically significant positive relationship between a public service and quality of life may be interpreted to mean that as the perceptions of quality of life improved for a particular group of people, their rankings of the public service also rose.

In contrast, statistically significant inter-correlations between the perceived change in quality of life during the past several years (whether it had improved or worsened, etc.) and levels of satisfaction with public services for all three sectors were all negative associations, with one exception (Table 2). Also, in this analysis the majority of significant correlations were found in conjunction with the household residents, and no significant relationships emerged for the business sector. Citizens who ranked the quality of life as having improved over time tended to rank satisfaction with solid waste disposal, public schools, and media as low. However, citizens who felt the quality of life had improved over time also were more likely to rank welfare as high. For the government leaders, this relationship was reversed: those who thought that the quality of life had improved tended to rank welfare as low.

Spearman's rho inter-correlations also were utilized in analyzing the relationship between perceived quality of life and satisfaction with public services for all three sectors (household, business, and government leader) in each county (Table 4). The objective of this additional analysis was to determine the extent of consensus among different segments of the population within each county as well as among the same sectors in different counties.

Significant inter-correlations were found between quality of life and measures of public services in a few cases (at the .05 level).* The most striking findings were the large differences in the analysis by county and by region. Data presented in Table 4 reveal the general lack of attitudinal consensus which was reflected within each county and in the region. In Clay County the attitudes of both government and business leaders towards quality of life were significantly correlated with solid waste disposal, and significant correlations between quality of life and other public services were also recorded for the business sector in Clay County.

To some extent the individual county-sector data reflect pre-survey hypotheses about the study area. Clay County was known to be engaged in extensive upgrading of the primary services of water, sewers, and solid waste. Most of the development effort was being implemented by government and business leaders. Hence, awareness of activity concerning various public services and their importance to perceived quality of life may have resulted in these correlations. Awareness levels, however, are not sufficient to account for the inconsistencies in correlation coefficients between sectors.

A general lack of significant correlations prevailed among respondents relative to quality of life and certain public services. For example, there were no instances in which health services were significantly correlated with quality of life. This was a surprising finding since health services typically are thought to be an important component of life quality. Another study (Pieper et al., 1974:6) found that the community leaders were generally less favorable in their assessments of health care than the household residents, which may be explained by differing standards of need. Objective standards document a need for expansion of health services in the three study counties, especially in Cleburne County, but apparently these needs were not reflected in the quality of life measure.

---

*Other significant relationships emerged at lower levels of probability. While these findings have limited usefulness in building models of the components of quality of life, they still may have important policy implications for local leaders.

Relationships between other public services and quality of life were rather mixed. Expectations that school satisfaction would be an important factor for all respondents were dispelled. Only in Clay County did significant relationships between public schools and quality of life exist and the direction of association was reversed for those sectors (Table 4). Little could be said about the remaining services in any area.

Urban-Rural Assessments of Life Quality Aspects

There was a marked contrast between the responses of the three survey sectors in both rural and urban-type growth areas (Table 5). Yet, there were no substantive differences between urban and rural responses. For example, over 90% of the rural leaders and 85% of the urban leaders felt that the quality of life was improved or much improved. However, over 50% of both urban and rural household heads felt that quality of life was worse or much worse. Most business respondents (over 80%) felt that conditions were improved (Table 6). Why was there such a division between household residents and government and business leaders? A portion of the attitude variation was accounted for by the observation that over 30% of the rural government leaders and business managers felt that conditions were still only fair although improvement has occurred. As expected more urban than rural respondents, except householders, thought life quality was at least good (Table 7).

To determine specifically what was causing the variation in responses among sectors, the inter-correlations between sector attitudes and services were calculated. The typical hypothesis is that urban areas, even relatively small communities, are equipped to provide more and better services to the public than rural areas, thus resulting in different levels of community satisfaction. The correlation analysis provided only minimum support for this hypothesis in the three county study area. A more likely explanation is that in rural areas, many so-called "public" services are actually provided on a private basis either due to personal preference or non-availability. This absence of some primary services may be partially responsible for the low magnitude of correlation coefficients and the general lack of significant relationships between satisfaction with public services and perceived quality of life, especially in the analyses in which the separate effects of residence or county are not considered. Specific findings taking into account urban-rural residence are summarized in Table 5.

In summary, the differences between the three sectors (household residents, government leaders, and business leaders) in the three counties are more impressive than the similarities. The lack of uniformity between groups in different counties attests to definite dissimilarities between conditions in the three counties. Within-county differences were noteworthy also by type of sector. Not only were statistically significant relationships between a particular aspect of life and the general quality of life lacking among different sectors in the same county, or among the same sectors in different counties, but in a few cases where significant correlations emerged among similar groups, the direction of the relationship was reversed (e.g. business leaders vs. household residents of Clay County in regard to public schools and the quality of life).

The utilization of place of residence (rural vs. urban) as a control condition produced useful results. In some cases, specification occurred and frequently resulted in a strengthening of the relationship among the rural segment and the disappearance of the relationship among the urban residents.

In other cases, the use of place of residence caused the original correlation to disappear entirely. Also, a few new inter-correlations emerged between particular aspects of public services and utilities and the general quality of life.

Prediction of Quality of Life

Multiple regression and the derivation of the statistic R^2 (the square of the multiple correlation coefficient) from linear models of the relevant variables were utilized in order to evaluate further the relationship between quality of life and satisfaction with public services. For the complete model, the largest R^2's were associated with the following groups: the household residents of Clay County (23% predictability), and Cleburne County (27%), the business owners/managers of Clay County (40%) and the government leaders of Clay County (35%), Cleburne County (76%), and Randolph County (60%) (Table 8). Thus, it was far easier to predict subjective feelings of quality of life among the government officials from levels of satisfaction with public services than among the citizenry. Considering that demographic variables were utilized as independent variables in the household model and not in the models of business or government leaders, it becomes apparent that satisfaction with public services was a more essential component in the quality of life for the government leaders than for the ordinary resident of these rural communities.

In searching for any particular variables that seemed to stand out as contributing the most towards the prediction of feelings of quality of life, water services and solid waste disposal were the largest contributors for the government leaders (in all counties). Interaction effects were minimal. In attempting to find a substantively meaningful limited model, it was hypothesized that those services which could be provided on a private basis (such as septic tanks in lieu of sewage, dumping instead of solid waste disposal) versus services that were strictly public (telephone, media, etc.) might be a relevant distinction between satisfaction levels. However, statistically this hypothesis could not be substantiated, either by predictive ability from a regression model or through factor analysis.

Conclusion

In this study several statistical techniques were utilized to examine the relationship between perceived quality of life and satisfaction with different types of public services. The findings seem to support the theoretical proposition that levels of satisfaction are the result of multiple determinants which differ over time and according to circumstances. Different issues or domains in life assume importance at certain periods and diminish in importance as other aspects become crucial to subjective feelings of quality of life. These issues differ between sub-groups as well as between individuals. In this analysis, the community leaders seemed to reflect a broader outlook on issues in the county while the household residents took a more particularistic perspective. The business owners/managers seemed to take a middle position in many cases.

While none of the measures of satisfaction with different types of public services, either singly or in association with other measures, were especially predictive of subjective quality of life, the measures of public

utilities such as water services, sewage services and especially solid waste disposal did stand out as making the largest contributions to the prediction of quality of life. The low degree of predictability of quality of life from satisfaction with public services does not necessarily imply either that satisfaction levels were generally high or that felt needs do not exist among these communities. A majority of respondents did indicate that most public services were less than adequate, or did not exist. Satisfaction levels however, are not in themselves indicators of felt needs. In many rural areas, needs for public utilities are met on a private basis.

The comparison of results between perceived quality of life and quality of life over time revealed considerable difference between correlates of the two dependent variables. Generally citizens who ranked the quality of life as having improved over the past several years were more likely than persons who thought that the quality of life had changed for the worst to exhibit low levels of satisfaction with certain public services. Current rankings of quality of life revealed that the business owners/managers who ranked the quality of life high also ranked satisfaction with a particular public service as high.

Generally the differences between the three sectors (household residents, government leaders, and business owners/managers) in each county as revealed in the relationship between subjective feelings of quality of life and satisfaction levels with public services affirms definite dissimilarities between specific attitudes in the three counties. There were also substantial differences among the same sectors in different counties, indicating the absence of a basis for regional consensus.

The policy implications of this study are not clear-cut. It is evident, however, that despite the social and economic characteristics shared in common among the three counties, perceptions of the adequacy of public services as related to overall feelings of quality of life varied considerably. This indicates that generalizations about a region based only on objective criteria are hazardous. Apparently the following factors are all important determinants of the ways in which levels of satisfaction with public services affects the quality of life: 1) differential access to resources (availability vs. nonavailability of public services), 2) differences in perspective, as exhibited by leaders with a universalistic outlook or citizens with a particularistic outlook, and 3) differences in personal characteristics, such as sex, race, etc.

References

Alston, Jon P., George D. Lowe, and Alice Wrigley
1974 "Socioeconomic correlates for four dimensions of self-perceived satisfaction." Human Organization 33:99-102.

Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse and Willard L. Rodgers
1976 The Quality of American Life. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Coleman, A. Lee
1975 "Quality of life: How community leaders and ordinary residents assess various aspects of life in four Kentucky mountain counties." Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky (RS-45).

Dalkey, Norman C., Daniel L. Rourke, Ralph Lewis and David Snyder
1972 Studies in the Quality of Life. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Gerson, Elihu M.
1976 "On 'quality of life.'" American Sociological Review 41:793-806.

Marans, Robert W. and Willard Rodgers
1974 "Toward an understanding of community satisfaction." In A. H. Hawley and V. P. Rock (eds.), Metropolitan America: Papers on the State of Knowledge. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.

Pieper, Hanns G., Nicholas A. Holt and H. Max Miller
1974 "Perceptions of quality of life in rural open-country areas: A case study." Proceedings of Rural Sociology Section, Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists.

Singh, R. N. and Carolyn Snow
1976 "Selected factors related to community residents' levels of satisfaction." Paper presented at the Mid-South Sociological Association.

Steelman, Virginia P. and Dennis Evans
1976 "Operationalization of quality of life indicators by county knowledgeables." Proceedings of Rural Sociology Section, Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Citizenry and Perceived Quality of Life

	Quality of Life: High	Quality of Life: Low
	% Responses	
1) Age of Citizen		
Under 35	51	49
35-50	43	57
over 50	45	55
Total Numbers	(198)	(231)
$X^2 = 1.60$, NS		
Kendall's Tau C = 0.04, NS		
2) Sex of Citizen		
Male	38	62
Female	53	47
Total Numbers	(200)	(228)
$X^2 = 9.18$, $p < .01$		
Tau B = -0.15, $p < .001$		
3) Race of Citizen		
White	50	50
Nonwhite	21	79
Total Numbers	(199)	(229)
$X^2 = 14.95$, $p < .0001$		
Tau B = 0.19, $p < .0001$		
4) Work Status		
Employed full time	54	46
Employed part time	40	60
Unemployed or retired	40	60
Total Numbers	(192)	(214)
$X^2 = 8.07$, $p < .02$		
Tau C = 0.14, $p < .01$		
5) Occupation		
White-collar	60	40
Blue-collar	48	52
Total Numbers	(123)	(121)
$X^2 = 2.21$, NS		
Tau B = 0.11, $p < .05$		
6) Type of Residence		
Mobile home	35	65
House or apartment	48.5	51.5
Total Numbers	(200)	(229)
$X^2 = 3.26$, NS		
Tau B = -0.09, NS		
7) Type of Road		
Paved	48	52
Other	30	70
Total Numbers	(199)	(229)
$X^2 = 4.38$, $p < .05$		
Tau B = 0.11, $p < .01$		

Table 2

PERCEPTIONS OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE AND SATISFACTION WITH PUBLIC SERVICES IN THREE RURAL ALABAMA COUNTIES BY SECTOR (SPEARMAN'S RHO)*

	HOUSEHOLDERS	GOVERNMENT LEADERS	BUSINESS LEADERS
Water			
Sewage			
Solid Waste Disposal			0.238 (243)
Health			
Public Schools			
Telephone			
Energy			
Fire Protection	0.157 (316)		
Welfare	0.111 (345)		
Law Enforcement			
Media			0.164 (263)
Recreation			0.158 (203)
Libraries			
Adult Education			

Table 3

PERCEIVED CHANGE IN QUALITY OF LIFE AND SATISFACTION WITH PUBLIC SERVICES IN THREE RURAL ALABAMA COUNTIES BY SECTOR (SPEARMAN'S RHO)*

	HOUSEHOLDERS	GOVERNMENT LEADERS	BUSINESS LEADERS
Water			
Sewage			
Solid Waste Disposal	-0.111 (355)		
Health			
Public Schools	-0.159 (358)		
Telephone			
Energy			
Fire Protection			
Welfare	0.193 (345)	-0.231 (107)	
Law Enforcement			
Media	-0.165 (428)		
Recreation			
Libraries			
Adult Education			

*All rank correlations are significant at the .05 level or above.

Table 4

PERCEPTIONS OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE AND SATISFACTION
WITH PUBLIC SERVICES IN THREE RURAL ALABAMA COUNTIES
(Spearman's rho)*

	Clay County			Cleburne County			Randolph County		
	Householders	Govt. Leaders	Business Leaders	Householders	Govt. Leaders	Business Leaders	Householders	Govt. Leaders	Business Leaders
Water									
Sewage	0.371 (26)		0.279 (51)						
Solid waste disposal		0.330 (49)	0.471 (63)						0.242 (122)
Public transportation									
Health									
Public schools	-0.204 (110)		0.254 (77)						
Telephone								0.423 (32)	
Energy									
Fire protection				0.366 (60)				-0.355 (31)	
Welfare									
Law enforcement									
Media			0.339 (78)						
Recreation									0.334 (104)
Libraries					0.435 (26)				
Adult Education					0.463 (27)				

*All rank correlations are significant at the .05 level or above.

Table 5
PERCEPTION OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE AND SATISFACTION
WITH PUBLIC SERVICES IN THREE RURAL ALABAMA COUNTIES
(Spearman's rho)*

Rural vs. Urban Differentials

	Clay County						Cleburne County						Randolph County					
	Householders		Govt. Leaders		Business Leaders		Householders		Govt. Leaders		Business Leaders		Householders		Govt. Leaders		Business Leaders	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Water																		
Sewage		0.371 (29)																
Solid waste disposal			0.570 (13)														0.267 (71)	
Public transportation																		
Health							0.301 (56)											
Public schools																		
Telephone							-0.228 (79)								-0.465 (19)			
Energy																	0.261 (73)	
Fire protection				-0.356 (35)			0.434 (34)					0.448 (22)						0.289 (52)
Welfare																		
Law enforcement							0.230 (75)											
Media					0.380 (31)													
Recreation																	0.556 (54)	
Libraries																0.544 (33)		
Adult education																		

*All rank correlations are significant at the .05 level or above.

Table 6

Urban-Rural Assessments of Perceived Change in Quality of Life
(Percentages)

	Urban Residence				Rural Residence			
Responses	Leaders	Business	Household	Total	Leaders	Business	Household	Total
Much improved	14.3	12.9	8.0	10.8	1.9	16.8	6.6	9.2
Improved	73.0	76.6	33.9	55.4	90.4	65.7	34.1	50.3
No change	12.7	8.9	7.5	8.9	5.8	9.5	7.8	8.1
Worse	--	1.6	43.1	21.3	1.9	7.3	42.6	27.1
Much Worse	--	--	7.5	3.6	--	.007	8.9	5.7
Total	100.0(63)	100.0(124)	100.0(174)	100.0(361)	100.0(52)	100.0(137)	100.0(258)	100.0(447)

Table 7

Urban-Rural Assessments of Quality of Life
(Percentages)

	Urban Residence				Rural Residence			
Responses	Leaders	Business	Household	Total	Leaders	Business	Household	Total
Very good	28.6	16.7	9.8	15.5	11.5	12.9	7.8	9.8
Good	63.5	54.8	40.5	49.5	55.8	46.8	36.3	41.8
Fair	7.9	26.2	38.2	28.7	30.8	34.5	39.0	36.7
Poor	--	2.4	11.6	6.4	1.9	5.8	17.0	11.8
Total	100.0(63)	100.0(26)	100.0(73)	100.0(362)	100.0(52)	100.0(139)	100.0(259)	100.0(450)

Actual questions used: In general and on the average how has the overall quality of life for most local people changed during the past several years?
In general, how would you rate the quality of life?

Table 8

Quality of Life
Multiple Regression of Quality of Life By
Levels of Satisfaction with Selected
Public Services

Variables	Household Residents			Government Leaders			Business Leaders		
	Clay County b	Cleburne County b	Randolph County b	Clay County b	Cleburne County b	Randolph County b	Clay County b	Cleburne County b	Randolph County b
Age	0.121	-0.035	-0.103	0.326*	0.072	-0.108	-0.005	-0.060	0.052
Male (Sex)	0.226	0.149	0.218						
White (Race)	-0.475	-0.897*	-0.202						
Occupation	0.017	-0.033	0.026	0.009	0.123*	-0.011			
Work Status	-0.092	0.158*	0.108						
Type of Residence	0.181	0.000	-0.503						
Type of Road	0.148	-0.010	0.231						
Water	-0.263	-0.760	0.132	0.169	0.357	0.008	-0.122	0.053	0.190
Sewage	0.358	0.000	-0.166	-0.596	-1.124*	-0.375	0.376	-0.335	-0.351
Health	0.058	0.080	-0.178	-0.123	0.724*	0.248	-0.205	-0.079	-0.005
Schools	-0.278	0.000	-0.143	0.151	-0.254	0.310	0.311	-0.182	-0.086
Recreation	0.490	0.021	0.204	0.354	-0.507*	0.014	-0.259	-0.187	0.517*
Telephone	0.192	-0.187	-0.012	-0.044	-0.067	-0.510	0.087	-0.484	-0.095
Media	0.041	0.177	-0.191	-0.085	0.093	-0.149	0.919*	0.547	0.150
Energy	-0.333	-0.014	-1.743	0.606	0.544	0.394	0.699	-0.851	0.429
Solid Waste Disposal	0.359	-0.100	-0.017	0.372	-0.835*	-0.193	0.690*	-0.056	0.371*
Fire Protection	0.263	0.356	0.164	0.062	-0.056	-0.175	0.023	0.413	0.068
Library	-0.147	-0.041	0.123	-0.178	-0.165	0.446			
Adult Education	0.194	0.094	-0.042	-0.134	0.758*	0.002			
Welfare	-0.037	0.159	0.112	-0.070	-0.226	-0.211			
Law Enforcement	-0.216	0.183	0.140						
Public Transportation		-0.190			0.448	-0.446			0.394
R^2	0.232	0.268	0.147	0.350	0.764	0.599	0.396	0.169	0.198

* statistically significant at .05 level or above